1 JESSE LASLOVICH BRETT O'NEIL 2 Special Deputy Ravalli County Attorneys Special Assistant Montana Attorneys General Office of the Commissioner of Securities and Insurance Montana State Auditor FILED 840 Helena Ave PAIGE TRAUTWEIN, CLERK Helena, Montana 59601 SEP 0 6 2013 5 (406) 444-2040 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff DEPUTY 7 MONTANA TWENTY-FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, 8 RAVALLI COUNTY 9 Cause No.: DC-11-117 STATE OF MONTANA, 10 STATE'S PROPOSED JURY Plaintiff. 11 INSTRUCTIONS VS. 12 HARRIS HIMES, 13 Defendant. 14 15 The State of Montana, by and through undersigned counsel, submits the State's 16 Proposed Jury Instructions, which supplement the previously stipulated instructions. The 17 proposed instructions include a Contingent Instruction, State's Proposed Instruction No. 16, 18 which is being offered only in the event the Court wishes to instruct the jury about an 19 exemption in the Securities Act, as requested by the Defendant. Because this is a question of 20 law, the State believes it's inappropriate to instruct the jury on the exemption. Mont. Code 21 Ann. § 46-16-103(2) 22 aday of September, 2013. 23 24 BRETT O'NEIL 25 Special Deputy Ravalli County Attorneys

State's Proposed Jury Instructions STATE v. HARRIS HIMES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document was hand delivered, picked up by courier, email, or sent by U.S. Mail, postage paid, this day of September, 2013, to the following:

Hon. Loren Tucker 5th Judicial District Court 2 S. Pacific #6 Dillon, MT 59725

Harris Himes PO Box 540 Hamilton, MT 59840

By email to the following:

dkaatz@mt.gov mgee2@mt.gov

SyllSmits

State's Proposed Jury Instructions STATE v. HARRIS HIMES

STIPULATED PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONS INDEX

- 1. Juror Misconduct
- 2. [Preliminary Instruction MCJI 1-102 (2009)]
- 3. [Preliminary Instruction MCJI 1-103 (2009)]
- 4. [Preliminary Instruction MCJI 1-104(2009)]
- 5. Count I: Theft by Deception
- 6. [Elements of Theft: Count I]
- 7. Deception
- 8. Knowingly
- 9. Purposely
- 10. [Withdrawn]
- 11. Count V: Conspiracy to Commit Theft by Deception
- 12. Conspiracy to Commit Theft by Deception
- 13. Conspiracy Responsibility for Acts of Co-Conspirators
- 14. Investment Contract Defined
- 15. State Defined
- 16. Offer Defined
- 17. Sale Defined
- 18. Issuer Defined
- 19. Salesperson Defined
- 20. Transact Defined
- 21. Voluntary Act
- 22. Evidence: Direct and Circumstantial
- 23. Evidence: Circumstantial
- 24. Circumstantial Inference of Mental State
- 25. Evidence Weight
- 26. Admissions or Confessions
- 27. Constitutional Right of Defendant Not to Testify

STATE'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTIONS INDEX

- 1. Securities Act Purpose
- 2. Count II: Failure to Register as a Salesperson
- 3. Willfully
- 4. Count III: Failure to Register a Security
- 5. Disclosure Requirements
- 6. Count IV: Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices
- 7. Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices
- 8. Material Fact Defined
- 9. Count V: Conspiracy to Commit Theft

- 10. Conspiracy to Commit Theft
- 11. Count VI: Conspiracy to Commit Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices
- 12. Conspiracy to Commit Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices
- 13. Security Defined
- 14. Person Defined
- 15. Pro Se Litigant
- 16. Exempt Transactions

INSTRUCTION NO
Securities Act Purpose
A primary goal of the Securities Act of Montana is to protect the investor, persons
engaged in securities transactions, and the public interest.
GIVEN: DISTRICT JUDGE
SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 30-10-102(1) (2007).

State's Proposed Instruction No. 1

INSTRU	JCTION	NO.	

Count II: Failure to Register as a Salesperson		
It is unlawful for a person to willfully transact securities business in this State as a		
salesperson unless the person is registered with the State.		
GIVEN: DISTRICT JUDGE		
SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. §§ 30-10-201(1), 306		
State's Proposed Instruction No. 2		

INSTRUCTION	NO

Willfully

A person acts "willfully" if the person is aware of what the person is doing. It does	es not
mean that the person intended to violate the law, injure another, or acquire any advantage	¦.

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 30-10-306(1); Comment 2;

Section 409 of the 1956 Uniform Securities Act, Revised to Section 508

State's Proposed Instruction No. 3

Given as Instruction No. _____ Refused _____ Withdrawn____ By_____

INSTRUCTION	NO.	
-------------	-----	--

Count III: Failure to Register a Security

	It is unlawful for a person t	to willfully offer or sell	a security unless the security	7 is
register	red with the State.			

GIVEN:______

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. §§ 30-10-202(1), 306

State's Proposed Instruction No. 4

Given as Instruction No. ____ Refused ____ Withdrawn ___ By ___

INSTRUCTION	NO.
-------------	-----

Disclosure Requirements

It is unlawful for a person to fail to furnish to a customer purchasing securities in an offering, no later than the date of the confirmation of the transaction, either a final prospectus or a preliminary prospectus and any additional documents, which together include all information set forth in the final prospectus.

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. §§ 30-10-201, 30-10-301;

Admin. R. Mont. 6.10.401(1)(j)

State's Proposed Instruction No. 5

DICTD'	UCTION 1	NT/O
INDIK	OCHONI	NO.

Count IV: Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices

It is unlawful for any person, in connection with the offer, sale, or purchase of any security, directly or indirectly, in, into, or from this state, to willfully make any untrue statement of a material fact or willfully omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading.

GIVEN:		
•	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. §§ 30-10-301(1)(b), 306
State's Proposed Instruction No. 6

INSTRUCTION NO	Э.
----------------	----

Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices

To convict the Defendant of the charge of fraudulent and other prohibited practices as alleged in Count IV, the State must prove the following elements:

1. The Defendant offered and/or sold a security;

AND

2. The offer and/or sale took place in, into, or from the State of Montana;

AND

3. In connection with the offer or sale, the Defendant willfully omitted material facts when he failed to provide Geoffrey Serata with complete disclosure information or a prospectus about the security;

AND

4. In light of the circumstances, the disclosure information or prospectus about the security was a material fact necessary to make the Defendant's statements not misleading.

If you find from your consideration of the evidence that all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the Defendant guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of the evidence that any of these elements has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the Defendant not guilty.

GIVEN:		
	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE:	Mont. Code A	nn. § 30-10-301	l(1)(b)	
State's Propos	sed Instruction 1	No. 7		
Given as Instr	uction No	_ Refused	Withdrawn	_By

•

INSTRUCTION NO

Material Fact Defined

An omitted fact is material if there is substantial likelihood that a reasonable inves	tor
would consider it important in deciding whether to invest.	

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: TSC Industries v. Northway, 426 U.S. 438 (1976)

State's Proposed Instruction No. 8

Given as Instruction No. ____ Refused ____ Withdrawn __ By ___

Count V: Conspiracy to Commit Theft

A person commits the offense of conspiracy when, with the purpose that the offense of theft be committed, the person agrees with another to the commission of the offense of theft, and an act in furtherance of the agreement is performed by any party to the agreement.

GIVEN:		
-	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 45-4-102 (2007); State v. Williams, 185 Mont. 140, 604
P.2d 1224 (1979)

State's Proposed Instruction No. 9

INSTR	IICTI	ON:	NO	
mom	\mathbf{u}	OIN.	INO.	

Conspiracy to Commit Theft

To convict the Defendant of conspiracy, the State must prove the following elements:

1. That the Defendant agreed with James "Jeb" Bryant to the commission of the offense of theft;

AND

2. That the Defendant did so with the purpose that the offense of theft be committed;

AND

That an act in furtherance of the agreement was performed by any party to the agreement.

If you find from your consideration of the evidence that all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the Defendant guilty.

If you find the Defendant guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Theft, he cannot be found guilty of Theft.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of the evidence that any of these elements has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt then you should find the Defendant not guilty.

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE:	Mont. Code	Ann. §§ 45-4-	102; 46-11-410		
State's Propo	osed Instruction	n No. 10			
Given as Ins	truction No	Refused	Withdrawn	Bv	

INSTRUCTION NO
Count VI: Conspiracy to Commit Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices
A person commits the offense of conspiracy when, with the purpose that the offense of
fraudulent and other prohibited practices be committed, the person agrees with another to the
commission of the offense of fraudulent and other prohibited practices, and an act in furtherance
of the agreement is performed by any party to the agreement.
GIVEN: DISTRICT JUDGE
DISTRICT JUDGE
SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 45-4-102 (2007); State v. Williams, 185 Mont. 140, 604 P.2d
1224 (1979) State's Proposed Instruction No. 11

INSTRI	JCTION	NO
TIADITIO		110.

Conspiracy to Commit Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices

To convict the Defendant of conspiracy, the State must prove the following elements:

1. That the Defendant agreed with James "Jeb" Bryant to the commission of the offense of fraudulent and other prohibited practices;

AND

2. That the Defendant did so with the purpose that the offense of fraudulent and other prohibited practices be committed;

AND

That an act in furtherance of the agreement was performed by any party to the agreement.

If you find from your consideration of the evidence that all of these elements have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the Defendant guilty.

If you find the Defendant guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices, he cannot be found guilty of Fraudulent and Other Prohibited Practices.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of the evidence that any of these elements has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the Defendant not guilty.

	GIVEN: DISTRICT JUDGE
SOURCE:	Mont. Code Ann. §§ 45-4-102; 46-11-410
State's Propos	ed Instruction No. 12
Given as Instr	uction No Refused Withdrawn By

INSTRUCTION NO. ____

Security Defined

A "security" is any note; stock treasury stock; bond; commodity investment contract; commodity option; debenture; evidence of indebtness; certificate of interest or participation in any profit-sharing agreement; collateral-trust certificate; preorganization certificate or subscription; transferable shares; investment contract; voting-trust certificate; certificate of deposit for a security; viatical settlement purchase agreement; certificate of interest or participation in an oil, gas, or mining title or lease in payments out of production under a title of lease; or, in general, any interest or instrument commonly known as a security, any put, call, straddle, option, or privilege on any security, certificate of deposit, or group or index of securities, including any interest in a security or based on the value of a security, or any certificate of interest or participation in, temporary or interim certificate for, receipt for, guarantee of, or warrant or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing.

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE:	Mont. Code	Ann. § 30-10-1	03(22)(a)	
State's Propo	sed Instruction	n No. 13		
Given as Inst	ruction No	Refused	Withdrawn	_ By

INSTRUCTION NO.	IN	ST	'nU	CTI	ON	NO.	
-----------------	----	----	-----	-----	----	-----	--

Person Defined

"Person" means an individual, a corporation, a partnership, an association, a joint-stock company, a trust in which the interests of the beneficiaries are evidenced by a security, an unincorporated organization, a government, or a political subdivision of a government.

GIVEN:		
_	DISTRICT JUDGE	

SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 30-10-103(16)

State's Proposed Instruction No. 14

Given as Instruction No. ___ Refused ___ Withdrawn _ By ___

INSTRUCTION NO.

Pro Se Litigant

Mr. Himes has decided to represent himself in this trial and not to use the services of a lawyer. He has a constitutional right to do that. His decision has no bearing on whether he is guilty or not guilty, and it must not affect your consideration of the case.

Because Mr. Himes has decided to act as his own lawyer, you will hear him speak at various times during the trial. He may make an opening statement and closing argument. He may ask questions of witnesses, make objections, and argue to the court. I want to remind you that when Mr. Himes speaks in these parts of the trial he is acting as a lawyer in the case, and his words are not evidence. The only evidence in this case comes from witnesses who testify under oath on the witness stand and from exhibits that are admitted.

GIVEN:	
-	DISTRICT JUDGE

SOURCE:	I hird Circui	it Criminal Jury	Instruction § 1.	18
State's Propo	sed Instruction	n No. 15		
Given as Inst	ruction No	Refused	Withdrawn	By

CONTINGENT INSTRUCTION NO. ____

Exempt	Transa	ctions
--------	--------	--------

State's Proposed Instruction No. 16

For Counts II and III only, a security transaction may be exempt if:
(i) the seller reasonably believes that all the buyers are purchasing for investment;
AND
(ii) a commission or other remuneration is not paid or given directly or indirectly for
soliciting a prospective buyer.
The Defendant has the burden of proving an exemption. Any exemption must be
narrowly construed to generally ensure investor protection.
GIVEN: DISTRICT JUDGE
SOURCE: Mont. Code Ann. § 10-10-105(8)(a) (2007); Mont. Code Ann. § 30-10-106; SEC v. Platforms Wireless Int'l Corp., 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 15328, 16 (9 th Cir. Cal.
Jul. 27, 2010).